

Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission

PO Box 1350 • 700 South Main Street
Cascade, ID 83611-1350



Phone: 208-382-7115
Email: cherrick@valleycountyid.gov

Ken Roberts, Chairman
Carrie Potter, Vice-Chair

Brad Mabe, Commissioner
Ben Oyarzo, Commissioner
Heidi Schneider, Commissioner

MINUTES

Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission
March 31, 2026
Valley County Court House - Cascade, Idaho
WORK SESSION - 9:00 a.m.

A. OPEN: Meeting called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chairman Roberts. A quorum exists.

PZ Director – Cynda Herrick, AICP: Present
PZ Commissioner – Brad Mabe Present
PZ Commissioner – Ben Oyarzo: Present
PZ Commissioner – Carrie Potter: Present
PZ Commissioner – Ken Roberts: Present
PZ Commissioner – Heidi Schneider: Present
PZ Permit Technician– Hannah Smith: Present

1. MINUTES: Commissioner Mabe moved to approve the minutes of February 25, 2026. Commissioner Schneider seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. P.U.D 26-001 Red Ridge Village: The Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a work session in order to discuss the P.U.D. The public is invited to attend. Public testimony will not be taken.

- **Idaho Code 67-6512, Development Agreements, Mitigation of Impacts, Proportional Share Presentation**

The meeting started approximately 30 minutes late due to technical difficulties. Brian Oakey, Valley County Prosecuting Attorney, discussed a memo that he had given the Commissioners regarding the Idaho Code 67-6512. This was done to give overview to legal authorities on mitigation of impacts. This memo and discussion were not specific to Red Ridge. Local Land Use Planning Act (LLUPA) is the governing statute that is the umbrella authority to consider applications for PUDs and Conditional Use Permits specific to mitigation of impacts. Oakey emphasized that County Planning and Zoning Commissions have broad authority when it comes to mitigation of impacts. Idaho Code 67-6512 and 67-6513 are the portion of code that applies, with subsections stating that certain studies may be required before approval of an application.

Oakey further explained that the Commissioners need to focus their attention on evidence on the record, and appropriate mitigation requirements should be based on studies. Impacts need

to be determined based on what is provided, and then mitigation decisions can be made. All service sectors that the government provides should be carefully considered, as well as how the proposed application will affect these services. These service sectors can and should be providing information on how, if the application is approved, it will affect the delivery of the services.

The second half of the memo is designed to help guide the Commissioners to not cross the line. This requires that, even though the Commissioners have the authority to require Conditions of Approval that are designed to mitigate the impacts of a development, they can't overburden a single property owner with improvements to the community that aren't necessarily caused by the approval of the project.

There are specific laws protecting private property rights in Idaho and Commissioners must be aware of those laws. All requirements must be based on the evidence in the record. This is in reference to off-site issues.

A discussion between the Commissioners and Oakey occurred regarding how to determine what mitigation is proportional to the impact. There will be some data that doesn't exist or will be difficult to obtain, at what point can the applicant be asked for an analysis? If there is no information in the record, then a decision can be hard to defend in court. Ask for additional information, be it from the applicant or from agencies. Be reasonable, don't paralyze the process.

The discussion evolved to Development Agreements and how companies are hired and paid for to analyze data. In robust applications, developers should anticipate the need to hire analysts. The county's engineer can review documents that have been turned in if necessary.

The Commissioners were reminded that the P&Z Commission is only making recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners for PUDs but it is very important to learn everything available.

- **History of PUD Processing in Valley County with Documentation**

- **Jug Mountain Ranch PUD**

1997, The project contained a golf course and the maximum units of 325. Their development agreement consisted of off-site road improvements. Not a lot of effort was put in, but it took a long time because it went to the supreme court where it was found the Valley County process was satisfactory. The project has its own sewer and water system.

- **Meadows at West Mountain PUD**

2001, There are currently 229 units, but they were approved for 381 units. 96 of the units were to be multi family. The proposed two 5-acre commercial sections have not been developed. There weren't a lot of amenities with the project. It was put forward as affordable housing. It will eventually connect into the main NLSW water system but is facing problems at this time; it is connected to central water. The project was the equivalent of a large subdivision and did not face much opposition, so it went quickly.

- **Tamarack PUD (fka WestRock)**

1998, A Capital Contribution Agreement covered roads, fire, schools, county services, and gave the County cash payments for 3 years to cover services until taxes kicked in. Tax info was provided to Commissioners. Currently it is built out to 700-800 units out of a total ~2100. All

potential impacts and issues were put into a spreadsheet and then addressed. There has been \$30 Million dollars in taxes created by Tamarack over the course of a 20-year span. An economic and fiscal impact analysis was done in 2009 by Idaho Economics, a private company. During the review process, Tamarack submitted a fiscal impact analysis that was completed by CH2M Hill to determine what the impacts would be to the county and service providers. Part of the process was getting all the agencies potentially impacted into one room and having a discussion led by the board of County Commissioners. Commissioners discussed number of meetings and timeline that had occurred during the process.

- **Garnet Valley PUD**

2023, 316 units proposed as affordable housing. There was a Development Agreement, roads, and assurity of loan income. There was a lot of opposition, but it didn't take a lot of time.

- **MacGregor Townsite PUD**

335 units, village-esque with some affordable housing. The Development Agreement covered sewer, water, roads. It will be on NLSW. Improvements they were making to the sewer system will improve service to others. Created spreadsheet was not as extensive as the one created for Tamarack.

- **Bella Reve PUD**

Approved for 698 units along the end of Kantola Ln. It was going to be on NLWS. It had a lot of wetland and water issues and ran into problems with the recession. The PUD expired.

- **Gold Fork Bay PUD**

This project went to the Supreme Court. Valley County won, the project was never developed and then they came back with smaller PUD proposal.

- ***Presentation and Discussion with Red Ridge Developer***

Christine Richmond of GSBS Architects in Salt Lake City, Utah. The company has been digging into issues that have been identified by agencies and the public. This includes the map relating to the WUI prevention plan and providing a map with detail about open space as it relates to wildlife. They met with Idaho Fish and Game and will continue to work with them, including getting input while creating CCRs. She states that the company is looking forward to continuing conversations around services in Valley County. She is aware that there will be follow up studies needed in the process, but they want to get the scope right for the studies to provide analysis that commissioners need. She states that this meeting is the kickoff for discussions about impacts and what mitigations would be.

Chairman Roberts asked Christine Richmond if they have reviewed the WestRock paperwork. The company should view that as a shopping list and be prepared for any/all those questions or requests. They discussed the difference in scope between Red Ridge Village and Tamarack. Richmond states she is hoping to leave the room today with a schedule regarding the meetings going through the spring and summer. She wants to quantify impacts and wants to know how to marshal resources appropriately.

Chairman Roberts reiterates that it is the job of the P&Z Commission to determine potential impacts of the project as well as appropriate mitigations and give an appropriate recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. It will take time to determine these factors.

Richmond states that they want to work cooperatively to get on the same page as the Commission.

The remainder of the Work Session consisted of discussing the below topics:

- ***Identify Agencies that may be impacted: road department, fire department, EMS, school, McCall, Fish and Game, schools, ITD, etc.***
- ***Identify grouping for agencies to invite to work with P&Z Commission.***
- ***Identify criteria to address issues and impacts with potential mitigation.***

The Commissioners and Director Herrick discussed scheduling of meetings and what needs to be required from the applicant.

Commissioners stated that they need more information on impacts such as water, fire, EMS, scale versus location, in order to decide how they can mitigate the impacts

It was determined that the Commissioners need to figure out what is lacking in the application and give the applicant direction. This brought up the topic of what is the difference between a PUD Concept Approval and a PUD Approval. What falls under a concept? What is too much to ask for from a concept? Was enough information submitted to make a decision? What is the applicant's idea of what they turned in, is it a concept or is it a full PUD? What is the applicant asking for?

Christine Richmond of GSBS Architects stated that they are hoping to get a "level of confidence", that as they get through the phases and engineering, and when they actually bring in each phase of the project for approval, they will have worked through the details related to mitigation and everyone on both sides are on the same page. The reason GSBS have asked for a concept is because the property is large and complicated. The choices made in phase one will affect the final phase, and they don't want to cause problems in phase one that appear in the final phase.

The Commissioners and the applicants continued to discuss what will be needed. Chairman Roberts stated that if the Commissioners are supposed to make an informed decision, they will need to hear from impacted services to see if the issues can be mitigated. GSBS has had conversations with some agencies and anticipates that a new fire and EMS station will be needed based on conversation with those agencies. Other things need to be done regarding managing impact costs. Similar things with traffic, water, and sewer would be needed as well.

Chairman Roberts stated that the Commissioners need to identify a list of affected entities, and the applicant needs to meet with them and pose the question "could the impacts of the project be reasonably mitigated". The P&Z Commission then needs to make the decision if issues are mitigated by the responses.

The Commissioners then discussed if the project being compatible to surrounding land use and the comprehensive plan counts as concept approval. Do they need to know if impacts are mitigatable before they can know if it is compatible. How much more information does the Commission need before they can make that decision.

The applicant stated they are ready to start having conversations about costs of things and impacts, and that analyses would need to be done, but they have not done it yet.

The Commissioners and Director Herrick discussed the comments received by the public. Concerns made by the public need to be addressed at some point. It would be helpful to see the comments broken down to “No” and why, and comments with impact concerns and mitigation options.

They then discussed when to meet and decide “yes or no”. Whether or not agencies should be reached out to first, and to what depth, was discussed. If impacts can be mitigated on a certain level, is the concept sound? Answers can be compared to the comp plan and the first three lines of the compatibility matrix.

A work session with agencies was discussed. Agencies would be invited to attend or comment and determine impacts and if it can be mitigated, and what is needed to help the agencies decide if something can be mitigated. Applicant could reach out and set up communication.

The applicant stated that agencies like IDWR and DEQ won’t be able to comment without a full analysis.

It was decided that it is the applicants responsibility to get answers and pay for the process to get the answers.

A list of agencies was created that would be invited to attend the work session or send in comments.

List of agencies: Valley County Road Department, McCall Fire Department and EMS, schools in McCall, Cascade, New Meadows, Idaho Fish and Game, Adams County, Solid Waste companies, ITD, West Central Mountain Housing Trust (does product meet affordable housing definition), Soil and Water Conservation District, DEQ, IDWR, Law Enforcement, Airports, City of Donnelly, hospitals, Idaho Power, sewer and water districts, Valley County Building Department, sheriffs, McCall Police Department, Idaho Department of Lands, snow mobile groups, transit companies, possibly Army Corp of Engineers, Valley County Pathways.

Workforce housing for construction crews was briefly discussed.

Commissioner Schneider asked the applicant about the plan for Adams County. The Applicant stated that a lot of the land would end up in conservation, with areas near preexisting communities possibly built out in 30+ years. GSBS is not currently working with Adams County beyond meeting them regarding the emergency egress route that would exit into Adams County as opposed to going through White Tail Subdivision.

The Commissioners, Director Herrick, and the applicants discussed some aspects of what the development would look like. Sewer and water would probably remain on the property, commercial uses on site would include a year-round farmers market, convenience retail, and other undetermined small format retail. Conservation of the land would likely be accomplished through deed restriction, HOA control, and a Development Agreement.

The Commissioners and Director Herrick discussed at what point it would make sense to look at/ask for economic and fiscal impact analyses. It was decided that these analyses were necessary before a decision could be made.

The applicant stated they are poised to start analyses but want to get scope right. Is there a list of groups that they should get bids from?

The process of picking an analyst company was discussed. The applicant will put out a request for a proposal to companies, and the P&Z Commission will pick one of the companies to recommend to the Board.

The time frame for how long an analysis would take, and when to schedule meetings was discussed. Two work sessions will be held before the next Red Ridge Village public hearing, one with agencies, one with fiscal impact analysis information.

The first work session will be May 21st, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. This will be the meeting with agencies to help determine if things can be mitigated in a reasonable matter. The agencies will be noticed.

Kierstin Deitrich, Director of the Valley County Road Department entered a discussion with the Commissioners about being unable to comment properly on the project until things are finalized. They further discussed that the main concern right now is about off-site improvements and funding. Are there major roadblocks or concerns? They then discussed mitigation of impacts off-site and Development Agreements.

McCall Fire Department confirmed what the Commissioners are looking for and if there are obvious deal breakers. The Fire Department would welcome a meeting with the developer before May 21st meeting.

The applicant is expected to reach out and have discussions with agencies.

April 21st 8:30 a.m. Commissioners Brad Mabe, Heidi Schneider, Carrie Potter and Director Cynda Herrick will be in a special meeting to recommend to the BOCC which company will be hired to do the economic and fiscal impact analysis report. The recommendation will be put on the April 27th BOCC meeting for the Board to approve.

The second work session will be June 25th, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. The fiscal and economic impact analyses will be discussed.

The Commissioners very briefly discussed a ground water study taking place after conceptual approval. If the Commissioners feel they aren't getting info back from agencies that will help make an informed decision, they can ask for more.

Chairman Roberts adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.